

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of April 8, 2004.

Claims 1 through 20 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1 through 8 having received an action on the merits.

Claims 9 through 20 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Concurrently with this amendment, Applicants are filing a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement for the citation and consideration of additional art and information in the application.

Applicants herein acknowledge the Restriction Requirement in the above-referenced application, and affirm the election to prosecute the claims of Group I, claims 1 through 8, without traverse of the Restriction Requirement.

Applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical errors and for consistent usage of terminology and numerals.

Claims 1 through 8 stand rejected.

Applicants have amended currently claims 1 through 8 and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 1 through 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 2 to clearly set forth elements of the claimed inventions using terminology for the elements of the invention as set forth in the specification when taken in conjunction with the drawings. The presently claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1 and 2 do not express elements of the Applicants'

invention using the means and specified functions thereof as set forth in paragraph six of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicants assert that presently amended independent claims 1 and 2 as well as dependent claims 3 through 8 therefrom clearly comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on Ohgami et al. (U.S. Patent 5,905,550)

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohgami et al. (U.S. Patent 5,905,550).

Applicants assert that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants further assert that the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

After carefully considering the rejection, the cited prior art, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed inventions of independent claims 1 and 2 to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Turning to the Ohgami et al. reference, described is a display device 3 comprising a box-shaped casing 15 having an opening 22 for a display, and a display unit 30 contained in the casing 15, the display unit 30 having a display screen 32a exposed to the opening 22. The casing includes display cover 20 and a display mask 21 coupled to the display cover 20, the display mask 21 having an opening 22. The display cover 20 has a rectangular flat bottom wall 20a, a peripheral wall 20b continuous with an outer peripheral portion of the bottom wall 20a, and support or seat portions 40 integrally formed on the inner surfaces of portions of peripheral wall edge portion 20b. The display mask 21 has a substantially flat rectangular front wall 21a. The front wall 21a of the display mask 21 faces the bottom wall 20a of the cover 20. The front wall 21a of the display mask 21 has the display opening 22. The opening 22 of the display mask 21 has a size covering a substantially the entire area of the front wall 21a thereof. The display cover 20 and display mask 21 are detachably coupled to each other by abutting the peripheral wall 20b

and projection 21b upon each other. A display 30 comprises a back frame 31 of a synthetic resin, a liquid crystal panel 32 supported on the back frame 31, and a metallic front frame 33 supported on the back frame 31 covering an outer peripheral portion of the liquid crystal panel 32. The liquid crystal panel 32 and frame 33 are fixed on the back frame 31 by means of screws (not shown). The display unit 30 is provided with a plurality of flange-like support portions 37 formed near the corners of the back frame 31 of the display unit 30 extending toward the outer peripheral edge portions 20b and 21b of the display cover 20 and display mask 21, respectively. Each support portion 37 being clamped between the support or seat portion 40 integrally formed on the inner surfaces of portions of peripheral wall edge portion 20b of the display cover 20 and the outer peripheral edge portion 21a of the display mask 21, whereby the display unit 30 is fixed in the casing 15.

Applicants assert that the Ohgami et al. reference does not and cannot anticipate the presently claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 because the Ohgami et al. reference does not identically describe each and every element of the presently claimed inventions in as complete detail as is contained in the claims.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 1, Applicants assert that the Ohgami et al. reference does not identically describe the elements of the presently claimed invention calling for “a top cover including a back and a side wall extending around at least a portion of the back, the side wall having at least one hole extending laterally therethrough, the top cover housing a flat-panel display of a portable computer therein” and “a flat-panel display including a back having at least one hole formed laterally therein mounting the flat-panel display in the top cover using mounting members engaging at least a portion of the at least one hole in the side wall of the top cover and engaging at least a portion of the at least one hole of the flat-panel display.”

In contrast to the elements of the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 1, the Ohgami et al. reference merely describes a display cover 20 having a peripheral wall 20b continuous with an outer peripheral portion of the bottom wall 20a and support or seat portions 40 integrally formed on the inner surfaces of portions of peripheral wall edge portion 20b. Further, the Ohgami et al. reference merely describes a display 30 provided with a plurality of flange-like support portions 37 formed near the corners of the back frame 31

thereof extending toward the outer peripheral edge portions 20b and 21b of the display cover 20 and display mask 21, respectively with each support portion 37 being clamped between the support or seat portion 40 integrally formed on the inner surfaces of portions of peripheral wall edge portion 20b of the display cover 20 and the outer peripheral edge portion 21a of the display mask 21, whereby the display unit 30 is fixed in the casing 15.

Applicants assert that such is clearly not the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 1. Therefore, presently amended independent claim 1 is allowable.

Considering presently amended independent claim 2, Applicants assert that the Ohgami et al. reference does not identically describe the elements of the presently claimed invention calling for “a flat-panel display having a plurality of side walls including at least two holes formed laterally therein mounting the flat-panel display in the top cover of a portable computer, the top cover having a back and a side wall having at least two holes therethrough” and “lateral mounting members extending laterally from the at least two holes in the side wall of the top cover engaging at least portions of the at least two holes in the plurality of side walls of the flat-panel display.”

In contrast to the elements of the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 2, the Ohgami et al. reference merely describes a display cover 20 having a peripheral wall 20b continuous with an outer peripheral portion of the bottom wall 20a and support or seat portions 40 integrally formed on the inner surfaces of portions of peripheral wall edge portion 20b. Further, the Ohgami et al. reference merely describes a display 30 provided with a plurality of flange-like support portions 37 formed near the corners of the back frame 31 thereof extending toward the outer peripheral edge portions 20b and 21b of the display cover 20 and display mask 21, respectively with each support portion 37 being clamped between the support or seat portion 40 integrally formed on the inner surfaces of portions of peripheral wall edge portion 20b of the display cover 20 and the outer peripheral edge portion 21a of the display mask 21, whereby the display unit 30 is fixed in the casing 15.

Applicants assert that such is clearly not the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 2. Therefore, presently amended independent claim 2 is allowable as well as dependent claims 3 through 8 therefrom.

Anticipation Rejection Based on Ma (U.S. Patent No. 5,570,267)

Claims 1 through 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ma (U.S. Patent 5,570,267).

Applicants again assert that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants further assert that the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

After carefully considering the rejection, the cited prior art, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed inventions of independent claims 1 and 2 to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Turning to the Ma reference, described is a flat display module including a display unit 1, a protective cover 2 fastened to the top side of the display unit 1 by screws (not numbered) extending through vertical holes 14 through the display unit 1 into and engaging a plurality of holes (not shown) on the bottom of the protective cover 2. The protective cover 2 having a plurality of retaining notches 22 and plurality of retainer rods 21 at two opposite sides. A display holder frame 3 holds the display unit 1 and the protective cover 2 on the inside, the display holder frame 3 having a rectangular center opening 31, which receives the display unit 1 and the protective cover 2, a plurality of hooks 32 and retaining holes 33 respectively fastened to the retaining notches 22 and retainer rods 21 of the protective cover 2, a plurality of outward half-round lugs 34 at one side, a wire hole (not shown) adjacent to one half-round lug 34, a stiff backing 4 fastened to the bottom side of the display holder frame by screws extending through vertical mounting holes 35 at the four corners of the display holder frame 3, having a plurality of outward half-round lugs 41 respectively matched with the outward half-round lugs 32 of the display holder frame connecting the holder frame 3 to a computer mainframe by pivots, and a lead wire 5 inserted through the wire hole on the display holder frame, the lead wire 5 having a first electrical connector 51 at one end connected to the electrical connector 13 of the display unit 1 and a second electrical connector 52 at the opposite end outside the display holder frame 3 connecting the flat display module to the computer mainframe.

Applicants assert that the Ma reference does not and cannot anticipate the presently claimed inventions of presently amended independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 because the Ma reference does not identically describe each and every element of the presently claimed inventions in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 1, Applicants assert that the Ma reference does not identically describe the elements of the presently claimed invention calling for “a top cover including a back and a side wall extending around at least a portion of the back, the side wall having at least one hole extending laterally therethrough, the top cover housing a flat-panel display of a portable computer therein” and “a flat-panel display including a back having at least one hole formed laterally therein mounting the flat-panel display in the top cover using mounting members engaging at least a portion of the at least one hole in the side wall of the top cover and engaging at least a portion of the at least one hole of the flat-panel display.”

In contrast to the elements of the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 1, the Ma reference merely describes a flat display module including a display unit 1, a protective cover 2 fastened to the top side of the display unit 1 by screws (not numbered) extending through vertical holes 14 through the display unit 1 into and engaging a plurality of holes (not shown) on the bottom of the protective cover 2, having a plurality of retaining notches 22 and plurality of retainer rods 21 at two opposite sides, a display holder frame 3 holding the display unit 1 and the protective cover 2 on the inside, the display holder frame 3 having a rectangular center opening 31, which receives the display unit 1 and the protective cover 2, a plurality of hooks 32 and retaining holes 33 respectively fastened to the retaining notches 22 and retainer rods 21 of the protective cover 2, a stiff backing 4 fastened to the bottom side of the display holder frame by screws extending through vertical mounting holes 35 at the four corners of the display holder frame 3.

Applicants assert that such a description as is contained in the Ma reference is clearly not the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 1. Therefore, presently amended independent claim 1 is allowable.

Considering the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 2, Applicants assert that the Ma reference does not identically describe the elements of the presently

claimed invention calling for “a flat-panel display having a plurality of side walls including at least two holes formed laterally therein mounting the flat-panel display in the top cover of a portable computer, the top cover having a back and a side wall having at least two holes therethrough” and “lateral mounting members extending laterally from the at least two holes in the side wall of the top cover engaging at least portions of the at least two holes in the plurality of side walls of the flat-panel display.”

In contrast to the elements of the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 2, the Ma reference merely describes a flat display module including a display unit 1, a protective cover 2 fastened to the top side of the display unit 1 by screws (not numbered) extending through vertical holes 14 through the display unit 1 into and engaging a plurality of holes (not shown) on the bottom of the protective cover 2, having a plurality of retaining notches 22 and plurality of retainer rods 21 at two opposite sides, a display holder frame 3 holding the display unit 1 and the protective cover 2 on the inside, the display holder frame 3 having a rectangular center opening 31, which receives the display unit 1 and the protective cover 2, a plurality of hooks 32 and retaining holes 33 respectively fastened to the retaining notches 22 and retainer rods 21 of the protective cover 2, a stiff backing 4 fastened to the bottom side of the display holder frame by screws extending through vertical mounting holes 35 at the four corners of the display holder frame 3.

Applicants assert that such a description as is contained in the Ma reference is clearly not the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 2. Therefore, presently amended independent claim 2 is allowable as well as dependent claims 3 through 8 therefrom.

Additionally, Applicants assert that the Ma reference further does not identically describe the elements of the Applicants presently claimed inventions set forth in dependent claims 3 through 8 calling for “wherein the mounting members extend through the at least two holes in opposed portions of the side wall of the top cover”, “wherein the lateral mounting members comprise bolts that engage bosses of the flat-panel display”, “wherein the top cover comprises a plastic back, pivotal couplings connecting the top cover to a base unit, and at least one metal bracket that extends from the pivotal couplings, the lateral mounting members engaging the metal bracket and the plastic back”, “wherein the lateral mounting members comprise bolts that

pass through the bracket and the plastic back to engage bosses of the flat-panel display”,
“wherein the plastic back does not substantially contribute to the rigidity of the top cover”, and
“wherein the flat-panel display comprises: a display panel, a display rim extending around a
perimeter of the display, and a display back . . . and the lateral mounting members
comprise bolts that engage bosses of the display back of the flat-panel display, behind the rim.”

In summary, Applicants submit that claims 1 through 8 are clearly allowable over the
cited prior art for the reasons set forth herein.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 1 through 8 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT, PC
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: July 8, 2004
JRD/dlm

Document in ProLaw